

United States Patent and Trademark Office

lh

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/627,402	07/24/2003	Mehdi Vaez-Iravani	TNCR.152.US7 2861 EXAMINER		
36257	7590 05/04/2005				
PARSONS HSUE & DE RUNTZ LLP			PHAM, HOA Q		
655 MONTGOMERY STREET SUITE 1800		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN FRAN	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			2877	
			DATE MAILED: 05/04/2009	DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/627,402	VAEZ-IRAVANI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hoa Q. Pham	2877			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status	,				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		·			
4) Claim(s) 85-95 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 85-95 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)	_				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date3/_3/_05 & 4/_11/_05		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/627,402

Art Unit: 2877

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 85-95 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,134 (Vaez-Iravani et al) in view of Knollenberg (4,893,932). Claims 1-11 of patent disclose all the features of the present claimed invention except that the first light beam is a polarized light beam; however, such a feature is known in the art as taught by Knollenberg. Knollenberg, from the same field of endeavor, discloses a method and apparatus for detecting particle contamination or defects on a surface of a material in which a first beam of light is P-polarized beam from the light source (14) impinges on the surface of a wafer (32) and a second beam of light is S-polarized beam from the light source (16) impinges on the surface of wafer (32); scattered light from the surface is collected and detected by detectors (66,72) (see figure 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

Application/Control Number: 10/627,402

Art Unit: 2877

the first light beam of the patent as a polarized beam (S or P – polarized beam) as taught by Knollenberg. The rationale for this modification would have arisen from the suggestion from Knollenberg that using two different polarized beams could detect different sizes of the particles (see column 6, lines 10-36 of Knollenberg). Thus, an accuracy of detection is obtained.

Page 3

If a proper Terminal Disclaimer is filed, claims 85-95 are allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: There was no prior art found by examiner to combine with cited art so as to satisfy the steps of: (1) collecting scattered light caused by the first beam over a predetermined area and integrating the intensities of the scattered light over said area to form a first integrated response, (2) collecting scattered light caused by the second beam over said area and integrating the intensities of the scattered light over said area to form a second integrated response, and (3) comparing the first and second integrated responses to determine whether a defect is a particle or a subsurface defect.
- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kato et al (5,245,403) discloses an apparatus for detecting extraneous substances on a glass plate.

Application/Control Number: 10/627,402

Art Unit: 2877

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa Q. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2426. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 6 PM, Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J. Toatley, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-2800 ext. 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

∕Hoa Q. Pham

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2877

HP

April 26, 2005